REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-21 are present for examination.

Drawings:

The Examiner did not mark boxes 10) and 10) a) of the Office Action Summary to indicate that the drawing sheet containing FIG. 4 filed on July 11, 2005, is accepted. Thus, applicants request that the Examiner acknowledge that the drawing sheet containing FIG. 4 filed on July 11, 2005, is accepted.

Claim Rejections:

Claims 1-17 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Webb et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,880,010) (hereinafter Webb).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb in view of Reisman (U.S. Patent Number 6,611,862).

With respect to claims 1-21, as amended, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method of maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between a client and a web server using a single HTTP transaction, comprising:

> "communicating an HTTP request from the client to the web server, wherein the HTTP request is configured to initialize a CGI that operates within or in conjunction with the web server; and
>
> executing operations associated with the CGI, wherein the operations are configured to perform the **two-way asynchronous** communication with the client **over a single socket connection** until terminated by the client or the CGI." (Emphasis Added).

A method of maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between a client and a web server including the above-quoted features has at least the advantage that, using a single HTTP transaction, operations associated with a CGI are executed, where the operations

are configured to perform the **two-way asynchronous** communication with the client **over a single socket connection** until terminated by the client or the CGI. (Specification; page 3, lines 12-25; page 5, lines 17-28; page 6, lines 5-13; page 6, line 26 to page 7, line 11; page 7, lines 18-24; page 8, line 23 to page 9, line 7; FIGs. 2 and 4).

Webb neither discloses nor suggests a method of maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between a client and a web server using a single HTTP transaction including the above-quoted features that allows for executing operations associated with a CGI, where the operations are configured to perform **two-way asynchronous** communication with the client **over a single socket connection** until terminated by the client or the CGI.

In the system of Webb, the server 110 communicates with the client application 115 over **two socket** connections. (Webb; abstract; FIG. 1). A first connection between the second server socket 127 and the second client socket 125 in the system of Webb is the request connection 124. (Webb; abstract; column 4, lines 51-55; FIG. 1). The request connection 124 in the system of Webb only carries information according to a **request-response** communication model in which the client application 115 makes a request to the server 110 and the server 110 sends a response back to the client application 115 in reply to the request. (Webb; abstract; column 4, lines 24-34; column 6, lines 15-23). Thus, the request connection 124 in the system of Webb only allows for **synchronous** communication, because there must first be a request received, and then a response is sent in reply to the request. As a consequence, the request connection 124 in the system of Webb does not allow for **two-way asynchronous** communication.

A second connection between the first server socket 117 and the first client socket 119 in the system of Webb is the notification connection 122. (Webb; abstract; column 4, lines 18-20; FIG. 1). The notification connection 122 is only used in the system of Webb to send a notification from the server 110 to the client application 115, and then the notification connection 122 is terminated. (Webb; column 6, lines 41-47; FIG. 4, step 415; FIG. 5, step 530). Thus, the notification connection 122 in the system of Webb is only used to send information **one-way**, which is from the server 110 to the client application 115, as indicated by the single directed arrow for the notification connection 122 in FIGs. 1 and 3 of Webb.

(Webb; FIGs. 1 and 3, reference 122). As a consequence, the notification connection 122 in the system of Webb does not allow for **two-way asynchronous** communication.

Thus, in the system of Webb, neither the request connection 124 nor the notification connection 122 allow for operations associated with a CGI in the server 110 to be executed, where the operations are configured to perform **two-way asynchronous** communication with the client application 115 **over a single socket connection** until terminated by the client or the CGI.

Therefore, independent claim 1, as amended, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art and, hence, is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 9, as amended, recites a system for maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between a client and a web server using a single HTTP transaction with features similar to features of a method of maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between a client and a web server using a single HTTP transaction of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 9 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 20, as amended, recites a method of maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between a client and a web server using a single HTTP transaction with features similar to features of a method of maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between a client and a web server using a single HTTP transaction of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 20 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 21, as amended, recites a system for maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between a client and a web server using a single HTTP transaction with features similar to features of a method of maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between a client and a web server using a single HTTP transaction of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 21 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

The dependent claims are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons indicated above with regard to the independent claims from which they depend. With regard to dependent claim 18 that depends from independent claim 9, Reisman does not cure the deficiency with respect to the teaching of Webb.

Conclusion:

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 8-26-05

By David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 23392
Telephone: (310) 975-7895
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257